

## **R E M A R K S**

Claims 1-14 are presented for reconsideration.

In the Office Action, claims 1, 2 and 9-12 were rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sato et al in view of Anne; claims 2 and 9-13 were rejected as being unpatentable over Sato et al in view of Anne and in further view of Sellers; claims 14 and 15 were rejected under 35 USC 103 as being unpatentable over Sellers et al in further view of Anne. Applicants note with appreciation that claims 3-8 and 13 were objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form.

While the Office Action acknowledges the Information Disclosure Statement filed on October 27, 2003, it is noted that applicants' attorneys filed a Supplemental Information Disclosure Statement on March 19, 2004, which was not mentioned by the Examiner in this Office Action. It is assumed that the Examiner has received this Supplemental Information Disclosure Statement, since the Supplemental Information Disclosure Statement is docketed in the file history of the PAIR system as being received in the Patent Office on March 19, 2004 and the complete image is shown in the image file wrapper. It is requested that the Examiner acknowledge receipt of this Supplemental Information Disclosure Statement in the next communication.

It is also noted that on or about October 27, 2003, applicants, to respond to the Notice to File Missing Parts of Non-Provisional Application, filed new Figs. 1 and 2 to respond to the requirement for replacement of the drawings set forth in the Notice to File Missing Parts. It is respectfully requested that the Examiner indicate whether or not this sheet of drawings containing Figs. 1 and 2 is accepted.

By this amendment, allowable dependent claim 3 has been amended to include all of the limitations of parent claim 1 and claim 15 has been cancelled.

In rejecting independent claim 1, the Examiner contends that Anne, which is directed to a device for repairing pipes, teaches an annular clamp element between two gas pipes with a conical internal surface engaging the two pipes tightly together. It is respectfully submitted that if one looks at the reference to Anne, Anne's external surfaces have the

conical surface so that the conical surface, such as a truncated cone 2 or 3, engages the end of the outer pipe. It is respectfully submitted that in applicants' structure recited in claim 1, the connecting device is primarily a closed annular clamp element with a conical internal surface engaging a portion of an external surface of the gradient coil assembly as the clamp element is centered between the gradient coil assembly and the basic field magnet, which is the outer cylindrical body, such as 1, as illustrated in Fig. 1 of the application. Thus, it is submitted that, contrary to the Examiner's position, Anne does not teach or suggest applicants' clamping element 3 having the conical internal surface 5, as recited in claim 1. Therefore, it is submitted that the combination does not teach or suggest the structure recited in claim 1 and that claim 1 is clearly patentable over the teachings of that combination and allowable.

It is submitted that of the prior art cited, the only reference that teaches a tapering internal surface for engaging the conical or tapering surface of an internal sleeve is provided in Sellers et al (Fig. 4). However, the wedges, such as 40, are not annular so that a plurality of wedges are required. Thus, it is submitted that the structure recited in claim 1 is not taught by any of the references alone or in combination and, therefore, claim 1 is allowable.


It is submitted that claims 2 and 9-12, which are dependent on claim 1 or a claim which, in turn, is dependent on claim 1, are allowable for the reasons that claim 1 is allowable.

With regard to claim 14, it is again submitted that Anne does not teach or suggest a connecting device including an annular clamp element with a conical internal surface, said conical internal surface engaging a conical external surface at the end of the gradient coil assembly as the clamp element is inserted between the gradient coil assembly and the basic field magnet assembly. For these reasons, it is respectfully submitted that claim 14 is also unobvious in view of the prior art and is allowable.

It is submitted that claims 1, 2 and 9-14 are unobvious in view of the prior art and, in view of the above comments, allowable along with allowable claims 3-8.

In view of the amendments and explanations contained hereinabove, it is respectfully submitted that this application is now in condition for immediate formal allowance and further reconsideration to that end is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
James D. Hobart (Reg. No. 24,149)  
James D. Hobart  
SCHIFF HARDIN LLP  
Patent Department  
6600 Sears Tower  
233 South Wacker Drive  
Chicago, Illinois 60606  
(312) 258-5781  
**Customer Number: 26574**

DATED: August 2, 2004

**CERTIFICATE OF MAILING**

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as First Class Mail in an envelope addressed to Mail Stop Amendment, Commissioner for Patents, PO Box 1450, Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 on August 2, 2004.

\_\_\_\_\_  
James D. Hobart  
Name of Applicants' Attorney

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Signature

\_\_\_\_\_  
August 2, 2004  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Date